

(Mostly) Politically Incorrect Essays on Politics and Art v. 6.0

by Norman K. Breslow

Various Essays Copyright © 1992, 1996, 1997, 1999, 2005, 2006, 2008, 2001, 2002, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2010, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2018

This entire ebook is copyright © by Norman K. Breslow 2016

Thank you for downloading this free ebook. You are welcome to share it with your friends. This ebook may be reproduced, copied and distributed for non-commercial purposes, provided the ebook remains in its complete original form.
Thank you.

Note: This ebook contains a jumble of essays and free ebooks I've written over the ages, all scattered here and there on the 'net. I've decided to put 'em all in one place. Some are on politics, others on art-politics, and others about things I just wanted to get off my chest. Be warned that many are politically incorrect, and so may anger you.

Contents

- 01 Don't worry, be happy v.3.0
- 02 On the Demise and Fall of America v.2.2
- 03 A quick guide to personality disorders written in 2006
- 04 Some Stuff You Should Know About Politicians v1.6
- 05 Some stuff you should know about history repeating itself and sociopaths
 AND how to spot a sociopath v.2.0
- 06 A Very Brief and Very Politically Incorrect Essay on the Similarities between Karl Marx
 and Barack Obama and others. v. 1.01
- 07 Who was Obama's Dr. Watson...
- 08 Thoughts About Rush Limbaugh
- 09 On the word Gay (a Politically Incorrect Anti-Homosexual Rant) v 1.5
- 10 My wish for American Leftists
- 11 In Memory of Jesse Helms.
- 12 Why I am eagerly awaiting the death of the NEA
- 13 Is the Speed of Light Relative to the Size of the Observer? (A Thought Problem)
- 14 How real is reality?
- 15 On Homophobia and Art and Fashion and.
- 16 Tom (The two requirements needed for art to be ART)
- 17 Film isn't an Art Form
- 18 My thoughts about George Soros v.1.4.4
- 19 On the concept of God v.1.0
- 20 A Complex Thought v.1.2
- 21 Why Communists are Communists, v.1.2.1
- 22 My Background

01

Don't Worry, Be Happy (Why Nothing Matters) v. 3.0 by Norman K. Breslow

You are welcome to share this essay with others. This essay may be reproduced, copied and distributed for noncommercial purposes, provided the essay remains in its complete original form.

Recently I reread James Michener's novel, "Hawaii". The story starts with a description of the formation of the Hawaiian Islands. Michener described a crack in the ocean floor which, over millions of years, let small amounts of magma (liquid rock) move toward the surface and eventually create the islands. At first the islands were barren, but over more millions of years seeds would be dropped here and there, either carried by winds or dropped by a passing bird looking for food. Eventually trees and other plants took hold. After many millions of years passed, the islands sank. But after many more millions of years, the crack in the floor of the ocean had released enough magma to again create the Hawaiian Islands, and more millions of years passed before the islands again had plant life.

Michener's description of the formation of the Hawaiian Islands may or may not be scientifically correct. However, his description got me to thinking about our life spans. I came to realize that we live one trillionths of a billionth of a quadzillionth of a ten-thousandth jilliaienth of a nanosecond, when compared to the lifetime of our universe.

Following is a partial list of some of the Empires and/or Civilizations and/or countries that have disappeared or are in the process of disappearing over the span of recorded history. Keep in mind that these countries had people who had hopes and dreams and loves and hates, just like you have.

Aztecs, Anasazi, Assyrians, Akkad, Amorite, British, Byzantine, Babylonian, Crete, Canaanite, numerous Chinese dynasties, Etruscan, Freshwater Tribe, Gauls, Girgashite, Goths, Greek, Huns, Hittite, Hivite, Incas, Islamic/Muhammadan, Jubusite, Khmer, Macedonian, Magyar, Mamelukes, Mayan, Mesopotamian, Minoans, Moab, Mohwks, Mohicans, Moravians, Indus Valley, Israel, Upper and Lower Egyptian, Judah, Mongols, Moors, Olmec, Ostrogoth, Ottoman, Palestine, Parthia, Pensacola Indians, Persian, Portugal, Ptolemaic, Perizzite, Roman, Sassanid, Seleucid, Sidon, Sparta, Syria, Timurid, Tyre, U.S.A., Vandals, Visigoths.

In light of the above, I realized how utterly insignificant we are, and how utterly insignificant everything we do is. Now that I've cheered you up, you might want to reconsider those things that you feel are **super important, like global warming, or the results of an election, or whatever the *in* thing to worry about is...**

Copyright © Norman K. Breslow, 11/2014 and 12/2016 and 4/2017 and 12/2017

ON THE DEMISE AND FALL OF AMERICA v. 2.2

For those who don't believe what I write below, I am including the following quote by Arthur Schopenhauer: **All truth passes through three stages. First, it is ridiculed. Second, it is violently opposed. Third, it is accepted as being self-evident.**

For about 500 years the richest and strongest country on this planet was Rome. (Look up "Roman Empire".) Toward the end of its glory days, the strength and power of Rome slowly started to decline. There is no single reason historians have given for Rome's decline and fall. The speculations range from Climate Change, to high taxes, to using poisonous lead plates for eating and poisonous lead pipes in the water systems, both of which led to a decline in the populations' IQ, to... well, there are lots of reasons given.

I believe the fall of Rome came about because the sociopathic politicians who ran things were bribed by those barbarians who were not controlled by Rome. There were many barbarian tribes. The barbarians wanted the goodies, and realized that they could get 'em by bribing the Roman politicians to get laws made which would allow their takeover of the Roman Empire easy to accomplish. It was a lot easier and cheaper to bribe officials than to wage all-out war.

For about 250 years, America was the richest and strongest country on this planet, and it too went through a decline and eventually it fell. Why? The answer is that the barbarians (mainly Russians and Mexicans and Arabs, among others) learned from the fall of Rome, and they bribed the sociopathic American politicians to make laws, or ignore laws, which allowed the destruction of the American capitalistic economic system easy to accomplish, and gave the barbarians a lot of goodies.

In the following few paragraphs I am going to briefly explain part of the process used for the destruction of Capitalist America, for those of you who don't fully understand just how the richest and strongest country this planet ever had, with the best health care system this planet ever had, became a third world country in a period of less than a hundred years. In order to destroy Capitalist America, and replace it with Communist America, a few things were necessary, including:

The lowering of the intelligence of the American people. Illiterate and semi-literate people who don't know how to think critically are easier to manipulate and control than well educated people who can think critically. In order to "dumb down" the American population, the local school boards had to be taken over by Communists.

I arbitrarily choose the year 1925 as the year Communist Russia began their stealth war against the United States. The Russian Communist government identified American Communists, or *fellow travelers* if not outright Communists, and backed their runs for seats on local school boards. Once identified and approached, the wannabe Communists were told that their school board campaigns would be handled on a professional level- for example,

professional speech writers were hired to write the lies the Commies would tell the voters, etc.

The few hundred dollars the professionally run campaigns cost far exceeded the few dollars that the typical civic minded mom or dad could come up with to spend on their attempt to be elected. As the first Communist school board members were elected throughout the country, no great changes were made in the various school curriculums. The changes would be made slowly and incrementally, as school boards accumulated a majority of stealth Communist members. As this happened, the school boards bought Commie text books and appointed Communist school principals, who in turn hired Communist teachers. Along with the Communist teacher's unions which followed, the rest is history.

To add to the dumbing down of the American population, millions of illiterate-in-all-languages people were allowed to enter the USA, and many of them were allowed to vote in elections, even though they weren't citizens, nor had any understanding of the principles America was founded on.

These defacto citizens brought with them their own cultures, based on authoritarian strong-men dictators who ruled through decree. Representative American government started to become a thing of the past, which was replaced with an oligarchy made up of the rich and powerful who understood that a Communist America meant even more riches and power for them.

In addition to dumbing down the population, the news media had to be organized and controlled. Think propaganda. If there is a large and diverse number of competing news outlets, then competing voices would be heard, and the people could become confused. If there was only one news voice, then the "party line" would be easy to tell the people, with no confusion possible. In the past, newspapers used to compete with each other for readership. The larger the readership, the more money the newspapers could charge their advertisers, because more people would see their ads. Over the years, the newspapers began to disappear as computers and other electronic media sources began to flourish. And newspapers have merged with each other, and/or bought other news sources, and cable TV stations own or are owned by news sources, as are the movie and radio and music providers. Well, many of these sources are owned by the same conglomerates, which set the tone for the story-lines.

Not only did the population need to be dumbed down, and the media organized to give the party line, but a replacement American culture had to be created. How about making homosexuality "in", and creating a culture which glorified criminals, as in gangsta rap music and culture. In short, turn the old American culture upside down. This was accomplished by the homosexual takeover of the entertainment industry, and their subcultures- movies, television, music, etc. Now young people idealize black gangstas with gold teeth who refer to women as bitches. These are the role models for the up and coming generation(s).

And, what better way to dumb down the population than to make the use of marijuana and similar drugs freely available, and not prosecute those found with such drugs. You know, have the propaganda machine tell the population that recreational drugs are beneficial and harmless. And so there will be millions of drugged people easily led in the direction the

Communists want them to go.

Also, the Hollywood homosexual media revised American history. You know, the people who founded America were vile, and the people who came to America over the years were racists, etc. Just make up lies and keep telling them to the ignorants who make up the American people. And, since the stealth Communists did successfully take over the school boards throughout the country, why not use the same tactic for taking over competing political parties? Since the Democrats were well on their way to being full fledged Communists, why not identify and back with financial support and with professional level campaigns stealth Communists who pretend to be Republicans, who once elected, will act and vote like the Communist Democrats.

This is a short version of how the Communists have taken over America. My America is gone, and never will return.

Norman K. Breslow 2008-2013

03

A quick guide to personality disorders, written in 2006

Many years ago I realized that I was being asked to choose between two or more personality disordered people running for the same public office, and to cast a vote to help decide which one would be the winner and so get the bribes. Because thick books have been written about personality disordered people, I will briefly summarize what personality disordered is. While there are currently 11 different varieties of this personality type, all share some things in common:

- (1) All such people lack a conscience.
- (2) Personality disordered people only look at the present and immediate future, and they don't consider the consequences of their actions.
- (3) They all lie with ease, and some have trouble telling the truth, even when it's not necessary to lie to get what they want.
- (4) They tend to be charming, and many have charisma. Think of the con man you may have seen depicted in movies or on television. They are "slick as glass". Now think of politicians. They gain your confidence, they are "Oh So Nice". Of course, there are politicians you hate. They are personality disordered too, it's just that you don't like what they are selling, but you do like what your favorite politician is selling.
- (5) All are egocentric. They think whatever they believe makes sense, and so everyone else should believe it too. They believe that their way is the right way. Because they don't like to be told differently, they surround themselves with Yes Men.
- (6) They lack a full range of human emotions. There is an empty hole inside them where other people store their emotions. They look to others in situations to gauge how they should react. If others are smiling, they smile, if others are frowning, they frown. If others are laughing, they make a weak and usually not convincing attempt to sound as if they are laughing. This is because they don't get it, they don't get the emotions of the moment. And because they don't get humor.
- (7) Another commonality is that personality disordered people don't hold grudges, simply because they don't feel the emotions that make non personality disordered people feel anger for long periods of time. As an example, we have all seen one politician bad talking about another, saying terrible things about him or her, and soon afterwards, sometimes even the day after an election or an important vote, the two may be on the same stage, arm in arm, acting as if nothing has happened between them. Personality disordered people don't get (very) angry, or if they do, they don't stay angry long because they don't have a full set of human emotions.
- (8) They have problems of self esteem, and so politicians see getting elected as a means of

convincing themselves that they are "good" and "worthy", because more people voted for them than for the other person or persons running against them.

(9) Add to the above that people aren't real to them, since people exist only to be manipulated for the personality disordered person's own purposes. Because personality disordered people don't have a full range of human emotions, they cannot empathize with other people's situations. Thus, they see other people as objects.

(10) Because personality disordered people don't have a conscience, because they are charming and easily gain your confidence, because they lie with ease, because they don't have a full range of human emotions, because they don't look to the future to see the possible results of their actions, because they manipulate people to get what they want, THEY ARE DANGEROUS!

Norman K. Breslow

04

Some Stuff You Should Know About Politicians by Norman K. Breslow v1.6

Bottom Line: All politicians are sociopaths. No exceptions. If your mommy is a politician, your mommy is a sociopath, says I. Got it? If you're skeptical, or think I'm being outrageous to get your attention, hopefully by the time you finish reading the following three pages, you'll understand the seriousness and accuracy of my position. Keep reading and learn some things about politicians and lawyers and talk show hosts and...

I started writing this essay 'way back in 1993, because I found myself getting very irritated listening to politicians being interviewed on radio and television shows. Speak about crazy people. Well, to be more accurate, they are personality disordered, not necessarily crazy. What really upsets me is that no one, except for me, seems to realize that politicians are at best sociopaths, and at worst, flat out crazy. Since the news people and talk show hosts who interview politicians are presumably well educated, I assume that they all managed to cut the same lecture given in their college psychology class, the one that discussed the different types of sociopaths.

One type of sociopath is the "con man". The "con" in con man stands for "confidence". A con man gets your confidence. He is charismatic (charming), and slick as glass, he lies with a straight face at the drop of a hat, and isn't concerned about tomorrow. Tomorrow he'll worry about tomorrow. Today he'll say whatever is necessary to make the sale, make the deal, defraud the mark.

Successful politicians get your confidence, they are charismatic, slick as glass, lie with a straight face, and aren't concerned about the future, with the exception of worrying about getting reelected. They say what people want to hear. The politician will say whatever is necessary to get your vote. No kidding.

I'll assume that you are a normal person. If you are, would you like to run for public office? And have your competition spread rumors, lies, and a few truths about you? Do you want to make "deals" with unsavory characters to get campaign donations? Do you think you could walk down the street and not be embarrassed about what people say and think about you after hearing what the competition says to smear you? You know, about your "sick" sex interests, or your "drinking problem", or that you are a homosexual, or that you're not a homosexual, or that you beat your kids, or that you once sold illegal drugs, or that your spouse sleeps around, or that you don't care that kids get hooked on cigarettes because you take tobacco industry money, even if you don't, or that you or your spouse had an abortion, or that you're involved with organized crime, or...

Would you place your kids in the position of taking heat at school because of what is said about you, even if none of these things are true? A normal person wouldn't allow himself or his family to be placed in that position. He wouldn't allow himself to be held up to public ridicule. He wouldn't allow himself to be the butt of jokes on the late night

talk shows. He just couldn't deal with the psychological pressure. An abnormal person can place himself in that position, because some parts of his brain, such as the conscience, just don't operate correctly. You see, the part of the brain which makes a person fully human, capable of empathy, capable of embarrassment, capable of having guilt feelings, is missing.

If you need someone to explain to you what a conscience is, and what guilt feelings feel like, you're a sociopath. If you're not sure what empathy is, it's the ability to put yourself in someone else's situation, to relate to them and literally feel the emotions that go along with their situation. It's the ability to identify with someone else's situation.

The most important thing to remember about a sociopath is that he or she doesn't have a conscience, which for the purposes of this essay means having a sense of right and wrong. The conscience has been described as an internal policeman. One that goes with you wherever you go, and lets you know if you're doing wrong, or about to. And without a conscience, there are no guilt feelings. A person lacking a conscience doesn't know what guilt feelings feel like. And so, without a conscience and without empathy, the sociopath can lie/cheat/steal/etc., and not care about the effect his actions will have on others. And not feel embarrassed or uncomfortable if he is caught lying or cheating or stealing. All he cares about is whether or not he gets what he wants.

Alongside sociopaths are the psychopaths, who are like sociopaths but who commit violent crimes. Think "mafia" and gang members. Psychopaths differ from sociopaths only in that they are violent. Besides that, they are the same type of personality. They have no sense of right vs. wrong, or fair vs. unfair. As mentioned earlier, they have no conscience, no internal policeman letting them know when they are out of line. Without a conscience, a person isn't fully human, and a person who isn't fully human is a subhuman. For many normal people, it's difficult to imagine that such subhumans really exist. Unfortunately, they do.

Only sociopaths will end up in political life, because only those subhumans can ignore the "shame" that others would find paralyzing when the opposition smears them. Because they have no conscience, and so no guilt feelings, and no feelings of embarrassment, they don't really care what others say about them, although they may pretend to. And they can't relate to other people's emotions, because they lack empathy. And only they can lie convincingly, without swallowing hard and start to sweat and stammer, and blush. Only sociopaths can lie convincingly, time after time after time.

Now, back to the question of why interviewers seem to ignore the fact that the politicians they are interviewing are, well, psychological cripples. Not fully human. Subhuman. I'm sure there is a reason. Maybe it's professional courtesy, and the interviewer's intention not to scare away other politicians because he asks tough questions, and doesn't make nice-nice. If that's the answer, then for high ratings, he'll mislead his audience.

Not only do sociopaths lack a conscience and lack empathy, they lack a feeling or concept of fairness. You see, when little children play, it's not uncommon to hear one shout, "No fair, no fair, you stepped on the line," or something like that. Or, one child might say that it isn't fair that another child wasn't invited to a birthday party. This concept of fair and unfair seems to be built into children's brains. Therefore, fairness is a built-in human emotion. Politicians not

only lack a conscience, but do not have the emotion of fairness. Fair and unfair are meaningless to them. Only what will score them political points is what matters to them.

(People who study the brain believe they have found that part of the brain where the concept of fairness, associated with the conscience, is located. It's called the Lateral Frontal Pole. Tests involving brain scans one day will be able to detect a sociopath's brain from a normal person's brain.)

It is important to keep in mind that while all politicians are sociopaths, not all sociopaths become politicians. Probably more sociopaths are attracted to the legal profession than to politics, and then some realize that there are more goodies available to a politician than to a "lowly" lawyer, and so they make the transition into politics. This might explain why so many politicians are also lawyers, or at least have graduated from a law school. You are probably aware that lawyers aren't known for their sense of fairness or for their honesty, but they are known for being liars, which the stand-up comedians joke, "*How do you know when a lawyer is lying? When his lips are moving!*" attests to. Just change lawyer to politician...

In summary, politicians lack a conscience, which makes them subhuman. They don't care about other people, only about themselves, 'cause they lack the emotion of empathy. Sociopaths have varying levels of charisma, that is, they are charming, and they are instantly liked by others for no particular reason. This ability to instantly get people to like and trust them is believed to be the result of a pheromone which causes other people to like and trust them. A pheromone is an aroma which isn't consciously noticed, but which does effect the person who does notice the scent without consciously realizing it. (Hard to believe, but pheromones do exist.)

Why sociopaths emit those pheromones is unknown, but I strongly suggest that when you meet someone who you instantly like and trust, who gives you the feeling, "I really like this guy", you make a note that you are probably chatting with a sociopath, and you should run like hell.

Why some people are sociopaths is unknown. Most shrinks believe that there is a genetic factor involved. A sociopath is born that way, many shrinks and researchers believe. One movie made in the 1950's called "The Bad Seed" brought the belief in a genetic cause for sociopathy to the average person's attention.

Finally, keep in mind that since a normal, relatively sane person wouldn't run for political office, we are doomed to being governed by sociopaths.

Norman K. Breslow, B.F.A., B.A., M.A.

05

Some thoughts on history repeating itself, personality types, Communism and control freaks, plus some advice on how to spot a sociopath v 2.0

by Norman K. Breslow

History is said to repeat itself. If it does, the question is, why? The answer is simple. There are numerous types of personalities, and each type does what is natural for that type to do. For example, the sociopath, who has no conscience and no empathy and who has a lust for power, often becomes a politician. If he's lucky, he becomes the dictator of a small third world country. If he's very lucky, he becomes the dictator of a large first world country.

Another personality type is the dogmatic personality. No matter what evidence is presented to a person with a dogmatic personality showing that he is wrong on any subject, he won't change his mind once it's made up, and he will insist that he is right. He won't budge. Not an inch. Never. After about 150 years of failure, Commies haven't figured out that Communism doesn't work. They keep insisting that it does, or will the next time a country tries it. This is an example of a Dogmatic personality type!. A control freak is a person who was hurt when very young, either emotionally or physically or sexually, or any combination of the above. They believe that if they can control everyone and everything around them, they can't be hurt again.

Communists, (also known as socialists or progressives or liberals or democrats or republicans) have dogmatic personalities, and are control freaks. If a normal person doesn't like a TV show, he doesn't watch it. If a Commie doesn't like a TV show, he wants it banned. Commies want to destroy what they don't like. When it's destroyed, they feel safer.

In summary, Commies are control freaks who want to control everyone and everything around them. Because they were emotionally and/or physically and/or sexually abused when they were young, they believe if they can control everyone and everything then they can't be hurt again. They have dogmatic personalities, so don't learn from the past that communism doesn't work. Commie politicians are not only control freaks with dogmatic personalities, but also sociopaths, who don't have a conscience or empathy. As sociopathic control freak politicians accumulate power, they become tyrants, which is why history tends to repeat itself. Sociopathic control freak politicians do what is natural for sociopathic control freak politicians to do. They try to accumulate more power and control at other people's expense.

How to spot a sociopath

Listen to their laugh. Sociopaths don't have a full range of human emotions. In any situation, they look at the people around them to show them how to react to what's happening. If other people are smiling, they smile. Easy enough to fake. Easy enough to make them appear to be

a normal person. Easy enough to make themselves seem to “fit in”.

Sociopaths don't get humor. The best faked laugh they can do is “Ha Ha Ha”. Faking a realistic laugh is impossible for sociopaths. Faking a smile is easy.

As an example of the sociopaths laugh, search the Web for “Obama laughing”. After almost five years as President, you'd think there would be lots of videos of him laughing. There are almost none. The best examples of him laughing that I found are on YouTube, in which he kinda-sorta goes “he he he he”. You'll never see him having a “belly laugh”, because sociopaths are incapable of having one. The type of (almost) laugh Obama has is sometimes called “a mirthless laugh” or a “performance laugh”. He has been coached to give a “he he he he” laugh instead of a “Ha Ha Ha” laugh because it is thought the “he he he he” is not as noticeably weird as the “Ha Ha Ha” laugh is.

If you do find a video of Obama laughing, does he sound like a person laughing, or a person trying to sound like a person laughing? You decide for yourself. I suggest that whenever you hear a person who has a weird “mechanical-mirthless-performance” laugh, watch out. Sociopaths should be avoided whenever possible. Just a thought.

P.S. Check out Nancy Pelosi's laugh!

P.P.S. For a scary insight into sociopaths, read “The Sociopath Next Door” by Martha Stout, Ph.D., available on Amazon. I think the author grossly underestimates the number of sociopaths in America, but I believe the rest of the points she makes are right on.

Norman K. Breslow, 2010-2014

nbreslow@aol.com

06

A Very Brief and Very Politically Incorrect Essay on the Similarities between Karl Marx and Barack Obama and others.

by Norman Breslow v1.01

After doing research for a still unwritten essay, I had an Epiphany- Ya see, for similar reasons, Karl Marx was doing in Europe in the mid and late 1800's, what Barack Obama and other Rabble Rouses have done in America in recent years.

It seems obvious to me that Black Rabble rouses are pissed off because they aren't White, and also because they, along with their relatives and Black people in general, have been discriminated against by White American Society. Sooo, the way I see it, the Black Rabble Rouses are trying to get even by doing their best to destroy the White American Society, under the pretense of helping poor people get out of poverty. As a bonus, they have arranged to make a good living for themselves doing this.

Roughly 180 years earlier, Karl Marx was born. His father came from a line of Rabbis going back a few hundred years. Shortly before Karl Marx was born, his father, who wasn't a Rabbi, converted from Judaism to Lutheranism, not for religious reasons, but because he was fed up with the anti-Semitism in Europe, and Lutheranism was the main religion in Germany at that time. Karl was brought up as a Jew pretending to be a Christian, and his hatred for European society was built on eons of anti-Semitism and his not being born a real Christian with all the benefits of being one. Sooo, Karl Marx, guided by his father, decided to destroy European society, by fundamentally changing it by creating a dysfunctional economic philosophy which would appeal to the poor people as their way to get out of poverty. His economic system couldn't work, and would bring about the downfall of the existing European society. This seems to be a major principal of Communism: destroy what you don't like.

Just as Marx's economic policies haven't helped get people out of poverty, neither have Obama's economic policies helped the poor people in America get out of poverty. But both have destroyed the societies they hated, which was their real goal. To this end, the self loathing White Communists have helped the Black Rabble Rouses in their goal of destroying White American society.

(For accuracy, I want to mention that both Marx and Obama built their economic philosophy on the work of earlier revolutionaries.)

07

**Questions: Who was Obama's Dr. Watson?
Who chose Obama to have this Dr. Watson?
Who found this Dr. Watson? v. 2.1
By Norman K. Breslow, B.F.A., B.A., M.A.**

For those of you who have a background in the field of psychology, the title of this essay should be all you need from me at this point. You can move onto other essays or tasks without missing anything of importance in the remainder of this essay.

For those readers who don't have an academic background in psychology, I've been thinking of writing this essay for a few years, but haven't been able to succinctly and orderly put my thoughts together. I need to be able to make my point and educate the reader at the same time, without turning this essay into a very lengthy and complex read. So I've been putting off writing this essay. Regardless, I'm making this attempt now, because I think the questions are of the utmost importance. Maybe someone can follow-up on this attempt.

First, I assume I should explain who Dr. Watson was. No, not Sherlock Holmes' sidekick, the guy who kept Holmes supplied with cocaine. I'm referring to John B. Watson, Ph.D., known as the "Father of American Behaviorism". Behaviorism was for many years the leading "school" or theory or philosophy of psychology in America. Dr. Watson, who for years was Chair of the Psychology Department of Johns Hopkins University, was the leading proponent of this theory.

Briefly put for this essay, Behaviorism is the belief that a person's behavior (what a person does) comes about through a combination of rewards and punishments. So people are conditioned/taught/shaped/programmed to become whatever their teacher, or society in general, wanted them to become. ("Google" Behaviorism.) Watson is known for saying that if you gave him a child and told him what you wanted the child to grow up to be, he could make the child grow up to become that.

It's obvious to me that Obama was taught, beginning at an early age, to be what he has become. Someone chose Obama to become the first outright Communist President of the United States, and taught-trained-conditioned/programmed him to become just that. A question that needs to be answered is, who was Obama's teacher/programmer? (Whoever he was, he did a wonderful job! He should be recognized!)

I heard a man on a radio show who claimed to be a postman who delivered mail to Obama's home in Hawaii. He said he once asked Obama, who was at the time a little boy, what he wanted to be when he grew up. A normal question an adult might ask a youngster. He said Obama answered, without pausing for thought, "I'm going to be the President." Whether this story is true or not is not known to me.

It seems obvious to me that at some time there was some individual or group of individuals

who decided to create a future President of the United States who would lead the country into becoming a communist nation. Somehow this individual or group found a Behaviorist psychologist who was capable of doing exactly what Dr. Watson said could be done, and who showed how it could be done in his many writings on Behaviorism.

A child was chosen and the experiment began. Someone (a "Dr. Watson"?) decided that the child should be of mixed race as the American people would love to elect such an individual. And it was decided (by "Dr. Watson"?) that Islam should be the child's birth religion.

If Obama's Dr. Watson could be found, it would shed light on how he decided that Americans were ready for a mixed race Islamic President. Thinking up that combination, and then finding a child who met that criteria, shows that Dr. Watson was/is a genius, and deserves recognition. Really! (And was Obama taught to be a sociopath, or did Dr. Watson look for a mixed race Islamic Sociopathic child? Or was one brought to him and given to him as a gift subject for this psychological experiment.) Heck, this is beyond my ability to wrap my arms around, but I do know that what I've described needs serious investigation. If Obama's Dr. Watson is still alive and was found, and he didn't want to spill his guts, he could be made an offer he can't refuse.

Obama was raised to admire and follow the teachings of Communism. His father hated America and everything America stands for, and he taught his son to feel likewise at a very early age. Was Obama's fathers' hatred for America a factor for "Dr. Watson" to consider in choosing the infant Barack Obama to be conditioned/programmed to become the President of the United States? Or who did choose Obama to be the subject for this experiment? And who chose Bill Ayers to become a "mentor" of the young Barack Obama? Was it Dr. Watson, or someone else, like the person or persons who found Obama's Dr. Watson? Tracking down the people behind the selection of Dr. Watson to use Behaviorism to create the President Obama our country has been burdened with is of importance, the way I see it. ("Google" Bill Ayers.)

Of course, in addition to a Dr. Watson, other factors were of importance. The media needed to be brought into line, enough money needed to be available for this experiment, etc. And an appropriate child had to be found to be groomed/programmed as the future communist President. Whoever the person or persons were, they had to be powerful enough to line up the media to write "puff" pieces about Obama and to refuse to ask probing questions.

All of this could be the basis of a novel or movie, don't ya think?
Norman K. Breslow, 10/2014

08

Thoughts about Rush Limbaugh by Norman K. Breslow v.1.0

I've been pissed off at Limbaugh for many years, thinking at various times that he's a Commie pretending to be a conservative or whatever, and at other times that he's just a traitor, without any strong political feelings.

For example, I remember when he said numerous times on his radio show, along with that Levin guy and that awful Hannity guy, "No third party, vote for a Republican". Whenever I heard that, I'd look at the radio and shout, "There's no difference between the parties, they both vote (in Congress) the same way." I guess they didn't hear me, 'cause they kept saying "No third party..." seemingly for months. And keep in mind that Michael Savage, on his radio show, has been saying for many years that there is one political party pretending to be two.

Oh, and don't forget that Limbaugh also said, "I will no longer be a water carrier for the Republican party". To which I screamed at the radio, "Why were you *ever* a water carrier for the Republican Party?" Seems to me he admitted that he had been purposely misleading his listeners. Why? For the money, that's why. So I decided that for money he'd help sell Americans into Commie slavery. That's what I mean by his being a traitor. And now he's pushing the second of what may turn out to be 50 books for children about the American Revolution. He has at least one caller each hour tell him how wonderful the book/books are. Okay, but it's obvious that the callers are professional actors or something similar, 'cause they don't sound like real people. Not their voice, nor what they have to say, nor how they say it. Much too scripted, says I. These calls are kind of like infomercials.

And there are others who have told Limbaugh that his callers on the subject of his books, (which are written by a team of people, I assume), sound like professional actors. He of course denies they are, saying that his audience is made up of super intelligent people, is all. Well, if that's the case, how come his callers on other subjects sound like normal people, with grammatical mistakes, etc., and with normal sounding voices? I'm just pissed that he thinks I'm so dumb as to believe his statements that those book callers are real people and not paid to speak and tell his listeners how wonderful the book(s) are, and that magically so many are able to get through to gush about his book(s). I'm pissed that he tries to pass off long (5 minute) ads as just people wanting to tell him how much they love his book(s). Yuck.

Another thing that pisses me off about Limbaugh is that he uses ideas from others and passes them off as his own. For example, recently there has been a lot of speculation about what happened to a Malaysian airplane that disappeared in flight. Limbaugh "theorized" that the electronics on the plane went dead, so the plane turned back to where it started, and flew through various countries airspace without identifying itself, and one of those countries thought they were being attacked and shot the plane down. It would have been okay if he had said something like, "One of the theories on the Internet is that...", but he made it very clear that this was his brain child.

The problem is that approximately 21 hours earlier I heard a caller to Michael Savage's talk show give that theory, to which Savage congratulated him on his creative thinking. If Limbaugh didn't hear that show, I assume that one of his people did and told Limbaugh about the speculation, and Limbaugh decided to appropriate the thought for his own. Of course, I can't prove this, I just add it to my list of things that irritate me about Limbaugh. Oh, I shut the radio off when one of his book callers called about 15 minutes ago, and forgot to turn it back on. That happens frequently. I just realized that my feeling of being calm was due to not hearing him push one of his books or teas or whatever, but I'm turning him back on just because I'm in the habit of hearing him say strange things in the morning, when his show is on the in Reno, Nevada.

Finally (for this rant), a Republican named Jolie or something like that won a special election in Florida for the House of Representatives. He was a political unknown and had almost no money and he ran against Obama and Obamacare and a bunch of other things, and he won by a landslide against a known Florida Democrat politician. The Democrats have started telling the Republicans that they shouldn't campaign against Obamacare, or they'd lose the November elections. Limbaugh asked why the Democrats wanted to help the Republicans win? Because they don't want the Republicans to win, so they want the Republicans to take a winning point out of future campaigns.

Not hard to figure out. But at the same time, Limbaugh is telling the Democrats how to fix their problem with their backing Obamacare when it's obvious that most people are against it. Limbaugh advises the Democrats to say that Obamacare isn't what they voted for, 'cause it's been changed so many times. Good advice. Let's see, the Democrats give BAD advice to the Republicans so the Republicans will lose the November elections, and Limbaugh gives the Democrats GOOD advice so they can win the November elections. Beginning to see why I think Limbaugh is a traitor?

Norman K. Breslow 3/14/14.

09

**On the word Gay
(a Politically Incorrect
Anti-Homosexual Rant)**
by Norman K. Breslow v 1.5 nbreslow@aol.com

I try very hard not to say or use the word "Gay". I've just used it twice. Yuck. You see, once-upon-a-time there was a wonderful word, *gay*, which meant both Happy and Carefree at the same time. If someone asked me years ago, "What did you do this weekend?", I could answer, "I went to the mountains with George. We had a gay time." Back then it would have meant we had a happy and carefree time. Very nice and relaxing. We left all our worries and anxieties behind us. Today it would mean George and I had homosexual sex.

Okay, educate me, what word is there that means "Happy and carefree"? The only one I know of was "gay".

So the homosexuals managed to appropriate a lovely word and drastically change its meaning. Today, in 2014, they are doing the same with the word *Marriage*. Seems they have tendency to do this, no?

I've given thought to how the homosexuals managed to change the meaning of a word, or add to that word a new meaning, and then have that new meaning replace the original meaning. Following is the only way I can 'splain it.

Assume that you are the president of the Used Car Sales Lots Association of America, a public relations/trade organization, and it is your job to get people to think positively about used car salesmen and the used car businesses. Ya know, most people think used car sales people are liars and sleazy.

So how do you go about changing their image? Well, you can contact every newspaper and magazine, and today, web sites that might write about cars, and request that they stop using the term "Used Car Salesman" and change it to "Buddy". So, instead of "The used car salesman showed the gently driven 15 year old car to the 93 year old woman...", the sentence would go:, "The buddy showed the gently driven 15 year old car to the 93 year old woman..."

Well, mister or ms. public relations person, how many publications do you think would change *used car salesman* to *buddy*? I say none. But, obviously, the editors or publishers of newspapers and magazines who were contacted many years ago and asked not to use the word homosexual, and to replace it with gay, went along with the request. Maybe some dragged their feet, but enough jumped at the chance to make homosexuals look less sleazy by using the word gay, instead of homosexual.

Why do we doubt that magazine editors would change used car salesman to buddy, but we know for a fact that all magazine editors changed homosexual to gay. The only answer I can come up with is that the publishers/editors back then were, yip, homosexuals, and wanted to

change their own image. Ya see, the image the word homosexual brought to mind was of a sleazy man wearing a trench coat with nothing on underneath standing in a school yard getting ready to flash the children, if not abduct and molest them. Really. By changing one word for another, homosexuals changed their image.

Knowing homosexuals as well as I do, I believe that when they discover this essay, and similar one's I've written, they'll scream that I'm a "homophobe". That's what they do when they can't come up with a logical retort. Question: What the hell is a homophobe? I suppose it means "Afraid of homosexuals", or "Afraid of homosexual sex", or, because *homo* means "same", maybe homophobe means afraid of two or more things that are the same, like a pair of socks. I don't know. Educate me.

Truth be told, I am afraid of homosexuals, 'cause they have discriminated against me since I started trying to get the art world to take notice of me and show my work and all like that. I would show various galleries in Los Angeles my work from time to time, and they always told me to drop back sometime and show them my new work, and then about six months later there would be a short lived "Movement" based on what I showed the gallery people. The people who got publicity and sometimes even got a college teaching job, were, you guessed it, homosexuals. No kidding. So, I am afraid of homosexuals, 'cause I've learned they can't be trusted, and they aren't very nice, if they are nice at all, and that they are heterophobes, and that they have caused me mental and emotional and financial pain over about 50 years.

Well, now you probably know why I try to avoid using the word gay, which I've used at least 9 times in this essay. About 8 times more than I used all of last year. It used to mean happy and carefree, and now it means homosexual, and I have good reason not to like homosexuals.

Norman K. Breslow, 3/25/2014

Added on 8/16/2014:

Rush Limbaugh asked the question how gays, who amount to no more than three percent of the population of the Earth, have become so politically powerful? I sent him the following email:

"You and your ilk are partially responsible for the homosexuals political power.
Why not go back to calling them homosexuals instead of gay?
You don't have permission?
You are afraid you'll lose some of you audience?
Regards,
Norman"

About half an hour after I sent the email, Limbaugh twice used the word homosexual instead of gay. Interesting. I'm curious to see if he keeps it up on future shows, or if he has a change of heart and reverts to using "gay". Time will tell.

My wish for American Leftists

By Norman K. Breslow v. 2.06

This entire essay is copyrighted © by Norman K. Breslow in 2017. You are welcome to share this essay with others. This essay may be reproduced, copied and distributed for noncommercial purposes, provided the essay remains in its complete original form. Thank you, Norman.

First off, you've got to know that if you are a leftist, I don't like you, and that I wish you ill. I want you and your children and your grandchildren to live many many many years in your Communist Workers' Paradise.

You know, where everything is free, which includes food, clothing, housing, transportation and medical care, to name just a few of the free stuff you want, and which I believe you deserve.

Where everyone is equal. Where no one has more than anyone else. Welllll, the Obamas and the Clintons and the Gores will have more, and others like them, but they are soooo wonderful that they deserve to have more. But the remaining 99.999999 % of the people are all absolutely equal. You will have what everyone else in the 99.999999 % has.

See, I want for you what you want for you. I'm a nice guy, really.

For those of you who aren't leftists and don't want your children and grandchildren to live in a Communist Hell, well, sorry, but I'll think of them as being collateral damage. You see, I realized early in life how awful humans are, and so I worked very hard at not having children. So maybe I'm a lot smarter than you are/were. I also have written that my America is gone and never will return, and so I don't care what happens to the current America.

As an afterthought, if living in a Communist Hell isn't bad enough for the leftists, then living in an Islamist Hell is what I wish for them. (Try reading the Kindle ebook, ***The Politically Incorrect Guide to Islam (And the Crusades)*** by Robert Spencer, which is also available as a paperback from Amazon.)

Norman K. Breslow, September 10 and September 19, 2017
nbreslow@aol.com

In Memory of Jesse Helms, a Brief Essay v1.01 By Norman Breslow

While Jesse hasn't died yet, he has announced his retirement from the U.S. Senate. All I know about Jesse is that he is a typical Southern racist, etc. But I heard a National Public Radio pre-obituary about him, and they mentioned, in passing, that among his anti-National Endowment for the Arts doings, he is the person who forced the NEA to end giving grants to individual artists. **BRAVO!** I guess I'll have to rethink my anti-Jesse Helms bias, since anyone who can think up cutting the piggies off from the public trough can't be all that bad.

This of course got me to thinking about the art world, and how the NEA ruined American art by flooding the country with "abstract expressionism" ideals. This led me to wondering whether, if I did write this essay, I could post it, since my thoughts inevitably moved to homosexuals who run the art world. Homosexuals is a politically incorrect term, and I suppose if a homosexual beat me up for writing it, or even thinking it, he or she wouldn't be charged with a hate crime, since homosexuals can't commit them, only breeders, as homosexuals call heterosexuals, can do that. I suppose.

Anyway, about the homosexuals and the art world. Art dealers and critics, etc., are the same type of people as the flim-flam men and women who sell aluminum siding with a hundred years guarantee, and who then disappear to other locations to bilk other susceptible people. The art flim-flam people make money selling gullible people art made by someone else. Okay. But wouldn't it be better if they could sell art that they made, or made by one of their friends, and then go off to Europe with the money. This way, there would be a hell of a lot more money to spend, since they'd have the money from both their commission and from the artists' share.

So some homosexual art dealer meets some pretty boy in a bar, and asks if the pretty boy can paint or sculpt or something, and is told that the pretty boy is only good in bed. What to do? What to do?

Well, if monkeys and elephants can win first prize in art competitions with their "abstract art", so can the pretty boy who is mistaken in thinking he's only good in bed. This idea caught on, and soon all the homosexuals smart enough to be art flimflam people were lining up to sell the work of their boyfriends to gullible people, or the work they made themselves and pretended was made by their boyfriends, and then go off to Europe. And so abstract expressionism became big, and remains big. And probably will always remain big. Sorry, but talented homosexuals who can actually paint are as rare as talented heterosexuals who can actually paint. End of argument.

Oh, about the politically incorrect term, homosexual. Well, the currently acceptable term is "gay". But I refuse to use that word. You see, dear and probably young reader, once-upon-a-time there was a Wonderful word, GAY! It meant happy and carefree. Not just happy, but both happy and carefree combined. It was a word you could hear in everyday speech. "Fred and John and I had a gay time in the country last weekend" wouldn't raise an eyebrow back in the

1950's and early 1960's and before, but eventually the word got hijacked and became a synonym for "homosexual", and so saying "I had a gay time" implied, or stated as a fact, that the speaker was a homosexual. Many heterosexuals didn't want to be thought of as being homosexuals, so they stopped using the word, "gay". I don't use it. Not even for "homosexual".

Anyway, thank you Senator Helms for all you've done to abolish the NEA. Your attempt to cut the homosexuals off from the public trough didn't work, of course, since they are a wily bunch. Most of the homosexuals who run the arts organizations, where the money goes instead of directly to the artists, give the public money to their boyfriends. Everything basically remains the same. But it was a good try, Jesse.

(I wrote this essay sometime in the early 2000's, I think, and recently rediscovered it, and I believe my point is still valid, so I'm publishing it now.)

Norman K. Breslow

nbreslow@aol.com

Why I am eagerly awaiting the death of the NEA

By Norman K. Breslow nbreslow@aol.com

SUMMARY: The National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) has been a feeding ground for art(ist) piggies since its inception. Additionally, it has rigged the direction that art in America has taken. Only with the demise of the NEA can the art 'playing field' be evened out. I don't expect the NEA to be disbanded in my lifetime, but I can hope, can't I? Since I am an artist, and have been for the last 35+ years, I realize that my anti NEA position is neither expected, nor popular among other artists. Regardless-

For many years the NEA had been a feeding trough for the fortunate little art(ist) piggies who could push their way to the head of the line. The "game", which lasted for years, (and hasn't completely ended) went something like this: In the beginning of the NEA, artist "A", being connected to the art establishment, got a grant to do an art project. Getting the grant helped him get a teaching position at a college or university. Eventually artist "A", because he had received a grant, was put on the committee which selected a new crop of grantees. He chose artist "B". He may have chosen artist "B" because the two were friends, or because they were sleeping together, or because artist "B" supplied very good dope at very low prices to "A". Or any combination of these or similar reasons. Now artist "B", on the basis of his grant, got a plush job teaching art at a local college or university. He also got more shows, and positive reviews. After all, he was an NEA Grant Recipient, which meant he must be good, no? Eventually artist "B" was put on a selection committee, where he selected artist "A" for a grant. This cycle could not repeat endlessly. "A" could not endlessly give grants to "B", who would give grants to "A". So other artists were brought into the loop.

While the above is simplistic, it is also accurate. Yes, there were variations on the theme, but just that, variations. Establishment art magazines did not report about the "nepotism" at the NEA. The gatekeepers kept the ugly little secret, secret. Enough artists could see what was going on, and how some little piggy artists kept getting rewarded by their piggy artist friends, but they could only grumble. Back in those days, the Internet was not what it is today, so artists had no means to effectively voice their displeasure. What they did have was indigestion every time one of the select little art piggies got another goodie, bestowed by their art piggy friends.

The damage done to individual artists' egos is the least of the problems created by the inbred grant selection system. Because artists of similar persuasions gave grants to each other, the direction of art in America has been rigged. As abstract artist "A" gave a grant to abstract artist "B", who eventually gave a grant to abstract artist "C", who saw to it that abstract artist "A" got some kind of goodie, who saw to it that abstract artist "D" got a grant, etc., the art world began to take notice. Non-representational art is in, and representational art is out. If you wanted to sell your work, you'd better be doing abstractions. The grantees who got teaching jobs were teaching that nonrepresentational art was in, and the impressionable students took note. Abstract art was "good", and representational art was, well, not as good, if not just plain bad. Within a relatively short time, fewer and fewer artists were working in

representational art, because fewer and fewer galleries were showing it, fewer and fewer art magazines were writing about it, fewer and fewer art schools were emphasizing it, and very few if any artists were getting NEA grants for doing it. All because some little art(ist piggies who were very smart realized that politics was the way for them to live a comfy life. All they had to do was take advantage of the NEA, with the help of the NEA administrators.

Years and years went by, during which the grumblings of artists got louder and louder. Eventually the nepotism became so flagrant that individual art grants were abolished by the NEA. Grants for groups of artists, such as a banjo quartet or a dance troop, are still available through non-profit and State arts' organizations. While an artist cannot apply directly for a grant, he can still receive one by proxy- his art piggie friend at the local non-profit organization can pass money to him from an NEA grant they received, so the artist can do art for a public exhibition, for example. This more cumbersome round-about method must be used because NEA grants for individual visual artists are a thing of the past. I guess this proves that you can just hide nepotism for so long, and then even the blind can see it.

I realize that I see the "rigging" of art through the NEA grants as a form of damage, while you may see it as a blessing. Regardless, much of the most flagrant abuses are in the past. If the "damage" has been done, why do I want to see the NEA out of existence? Isn't that like wanting to close the barn door after the horses have escaped? The answer is that I'm not sure the damage is not continuing. I have to assume that an "anointed" banjo quartet was selected over other quartets for a grant, and I wonder what safeguards have been taken to assure that the direction of banjo playing, or whatever, won't be rigged. I'm sure there are different views on banjo playing, and if one camp rigs the awarding of grants, and gets the "banjo teaching positions", and the "banjo criticism" jobs, what happened to the visual fine arts world will happen to the banjo and other art worlds. And I don't know the extent that the non-profit and State arts' agencies are or aren't continuing to rig the granting of money which they received from the NEA. I suspect nepotism is still flourishing.

I have found that asking the question, "Where is the money?" helps explain why things are done the way things are done. The NEA exists because it brings money to a select group of people. These people see to it that the NEA keeps getting funded. These people are administrators, artists, galleries, museums, etc. The NEA does not exist for any other reason than to funnel money to the "in" people, who practice nepotism, (and god knows what else). The "fronts" (spokespersons) for the NEA will argue otherwise, but that is what they are being paid to do, isn't it?

The only way to assure "natural selection" in art is to do away with the NEA. True, although the direction that art has taken has been rigged, given enough time without the interference and rigging of the NEA, we might find that the art world is capable of righting itself, and will correct the rigging. Maybe.

(I wrote this essay sometime in the 1990's, I think, and recently rediscovered it, and I believe my point is still valid, so I'm publishing it now.)

13

Is the Speed of Light Relative to the Size of the Observer? v.4.0

A thought problem that materialized in my head on 12/28/05

Premise: Exceeding the speed of light is dependent on the size of the observer. (Or, the speed of light is dependent on the size of the observer.)

Assume that you are at a baseball game. The pitcher's mound, rounded off, is 60 feet from home plate. The pitcher is 6 feet tall. He throws the ball at 100 miles an hour. You know this because you have a radar gun, or whatever, which measures the speed of the ball.

Now assume that you are transported to a planet that is twice as big as Earth. You find yourself at a baseball game. The pitcher is 12 feet tall, and the pitcher's mound is 120 feet from home plate. Everything is twice as big / twice as far, as it is on Earth.

Everything is twice that of Earth. The pitcher throws the ball at 100 miles an hour. Well, that's 100 of their miles per hour. One of their miles is two of our miles. Logic and the radar gun tells us that the pitched ball was traveling at 200 of our [Earth] miles an hour. To cut to the chase, if we keep increasing the size of the planet, eventually we find ourselves at a baseball game on a planet where a baseball pitched at 100 of their miles per hour would be equal to the (our?) speed of light, and if the ball was pitched at 100+ of their miles per hour, it would exceed the (our?) speed of light.

So, we have discovered that at a certain size, a pitcher couldn't throw a baseball faster than 100 (of their) miles per hour, or it would be going faster than the speed of light. And then there is the maximum speed of 100 of their miles per hour of the batted ball. And of a bullet's speed. And of a jet plane. And of the winds of a tornado.

On our planet, we have sub sub sub atomic particles. Assume a person who inhabited a universe made up of "stuff" in that sub sub sub atomic world found himself transported to one of our baseball games, with a radar gun. That person measures the speed of a pitched ball with an instrument set for their distances and speeds. For this example, the ball is traveling at 101 of our miles per hour, but the very very very tiny person would get a reading faster than the (or his?) speed of light.

Or whatever. I admit that I do not understand the implication(s) of the above. I also admit that this thought problem has me confused. Is it possible for there to be different speeds of light? Ours and theirs? Or is it that really really really big people would inhabit a world where many things moved at the speed of light. And an observer whose height was half way between ours and the really really really big peoples' would observe the ball traveling at the speed of light at a different speed of the pitched ball than we do. Feel free to unconfuse me.

How Real is Reality? (Only as real as your brain makes it) v. 6.0 2005-2017

Norman Breslow, M.A., B.F.A., B.A.
nbreslow@aol.com

Have you ever looked at a cloud and seen something other than the cloud, like a tree, or a horse, or part of a car, or a breast, or a zipper, or a schematic of a Pentium chip? I'm sure you have. Well, maybe not the chip. These images appear because your brain takes bits of cloud detail, a dark splotch here and a swirl there, and combines them into something more meaningful to you. Some people organize the visual information one way, while other people organize the same information in another way. Psychologists call this organization process "PROJECTION". Because each of us has a different personality, each of us is apt to make up, or see, different objects. To mangle a phrase, different visuals for different folks. However, while each person's projections are unique to that person, people with similar personalities are apt to create similar projections (visuals).

The understanding that people project different visuals and meanings onto clouds did not escape psychologists and psychiatrists. In the 1920's, the Rorschach ink blot projective test started to be used as a personality test. You are probably familiar with the Rorschach and similar tests. They usually consist of black irregular blots on a white background.

The Rorschach is a "test" because it has been standardized, that is, a lot of people have told shrinks what they see in the different ink blots, and their answers have been grouped according to personality types. For example, pessimists might see a witch in one of the ink blots, while optimists might see a clown in the same ink blot. Neither the ink blots nor the clouds contain any objective information. Both are "abstract" or "non objective" as far as their shapes are concerned. But both can be used to elicit information from the viewer, such as a picture of a witch or a clown, a horse's head or a castle.

Other types of "projective tests" exist. While some also rely on non objective or abstract shapes similar to those found in the ink blots, others use objective material to elicit a projected response from the viewer. For example, a person might be shown a series of cartoon like sketches depicting various vague situations, and the viewer is asked to make up a story about what is happening. One sketch might show a younger man sitting behind an office desk, while an older man stands to his side, looking at the younger man. One viewer might say that the older man is the boss who has stepped into the younger man's office to congratulate him on doing a good job, while another viewer might say that the younger man is the boss who has called the older man into his office to chew him out. Of course, there is no right or wrong interpretation of the sketch, just as there is no right or wrong interpretation of

an ink blot. Different personality types will interpret the drawings, or ink blots, differently.

To summarize, the human brain organizes bits and pieces of information into something that is meaningful to the viewer. Viewers with similar personality types will see similar objects when looking at non objective material, or create similar stories when looking at representational material. The objects or stories do not exist in the stimulus material. They are created by the viewer to explain, or give a meaning, to the brain's grouping of the visual data. These stories are called projections by psychologists and psychiatrists.

We all project. All the time. The ability and need to project is apparently hard-wired into our brains. It is part of being human. My personal motto is, "Life is a projective test". People project even when looking at material that does contain meaningful content. To give an example of this point, let's consider Siskel and Ebert, the movie critics. They often see the same film, sometimes in the same theater at the same time, and draw two very different conclusions about it. Sometimes they disagree so vehemently that one wonders whether they really saw, and are reviewing, the same film. You have probably gone to the movies with a friend and come away with very different impressions of the movie. The difference between you and your friend, and Siskel and Ebert, is that the latter are professional movie critics who presumably are using some type of objective criteria to form their opinions, while you and your friend presumably are not professional critics using objective criteria to form your opinions. You just like or dislike what you see. Siskel and Ebert are supposed to have objective reasons for liking or disliking what they see. The truth of the matter is that Siskel and Ebert are humans. They project. Their projections (opinions) are no more meaningful, or "right", than any one else's. However, they have convinced other people that their opinions are extremely insightful.

To the reader who asks, "Are you saying that there isn't any 'reality'?", I reply, "Yes". A "reality" may exist, of course, but it is filtered through our brains and personalities, and gets distorted. The mere fact that people disagree all the time about politics and religion should be a big clue to you that each of us sees the world in a unique way. Each of us has our own reality. Each of us projects differently. Interestingly, each of us tends to tell ourselves that the way we view something is the correct way, and those who disagree are wrong. Some people have a difficult time dealing with the fluidity of reality. They want, or need, an absolute reality. If you are that personality type, fine, just tell yourself that there is one reality, that you see it, and that anyone who doesn't see it your way is wrong. For the rest of you who can accept that we human beings do project our personalities onto every situation we find ourselves in, the silliness of the pronouncements of the art critics and historians and others should be self-evident by now. After all, their insights are just stories they make up to explain their brain's grouping of information, ala Siskel and Ebert reviews.

The intellectually honest art critic (laughing my ass off at that oxymoron) would state, at the top of each review, that the review is only his opinion, based on his personality. He would state that he projected onto each painting or sculpture or other art piece a meaning, and then made up a story to explain the projection to himself. He would state that he is now writing down this story for you to read. But this doesn't happen.

Instead, the critic tries to give the impression that what he is writing is "The Truth". It is

"Reality". If he likes the art, it is because the art is good, based on objective criteria. If he doesn't like the art, it is because the art is bad, based on objective criteria. It is not because he has created a story to explain his feeling about the art, and that he has a feeling about the art because the art has elicited a reaction from him, in the same manner that a cloud or ink blot elicits a reaction from him. The art critic maintains that his review is factually correct, based on his knowledge of art and his wonderful insight into the artist's mind. Instead, his review is based on his projection, which is a product of his personality (or lack thereof).

Keep in mind that if you are human, everything you know is a product of projection. Of course, this entire essay is an example of my projection based on what I have heard, seen and read throughout my life...

15

On Homophobia and Art and Fashion and...

By Norman K. Breslow, BFA, BA, MA, written in May 2017 v. 5.6

This entire essay is copyright © by Norman K. Breslow in 2014 and 2016 and 2017, and it may be reproduced for noncommercial purposes, provided the essay remains in its complete original form. Thank you. Norman K. Breslow

I try to avoid using the word “gay”. Really, it's NOT gay, it's homosexual. When I say homosexual instead of gay, I hear, inside my head, a bunch of homosexuals screaming “homophobe” at me. That's the standard evasive answer to anything said about them that the homosexuals don't like. Found at *dictionary.com*, **phobe** is a derivative of the Greek **phobos**, meaning an irrational *fear* or *panic*, and **homo** comes from the the Greek **homos** meaning *one and the same* or *equal*. The way I interpret it, being a homophobe means I am afraid of a pair of socks. Well, I'm not. So there. Take that.

I don't know exactly when the homosexuals took over Hollywood. The problem with the take-over is that the **creative** heterosexuals who used to run Hollywood are now woefully underemployed, mainly because homosexuals tend to hire or promote other homosexuals to the exclusion of heterosexuals. The homosexual takeover of Hollywood not only effects movies, but also television and music and other forms of art and entertainment. As a current example, there are “redos” of old TV shows, such as *Hawaii FIVE-0*, and *The Odd Couple*, which, with the exceptions of their names, have little to do with the original versions. I recently heard that a redo of the TV game show *The Price is Right* is due to appear on the TV screen. These are examples of the lack of creativity of the homosexuals who run Hollywood.

In the spirit of the redos, let me help the creativity challenged Hollywood types a bit. Why not redo *Leave It to Beaver*, with the Beaver being a transvestite and wannabe transsexual dealing with being bullied and wanting desperately to use the girls' bathroom. Just a thought.

And to let you know what a nice guy I am, I want to help the homosexuals by passing along this thought. It's obvious to me that homosexuals are suffering from a birth defect. When they were a fetus, they got too much of a female hormone if their DNA had them designed to be male, or too much of a male hormone if their DNA had them designed to be a female. That is the cause for their being birth defective. Therefore, all of them should qualify for one or more government programs/benefits/goodies, which when the homosexual lawyers do their evil, will mean big money for the poor birth defective homosexuals.

On a more personal level, over the years the HAM (Homosexual Art Mafia) has only been interested in stealing my creativity, and passing it off as the creativity of various no-talent homosexuals. Ya see, the homosexuals have owned the art world since the first cave painting. Over the years I'd show my art to gallery owners in the Los Angeles area, and they'd tell their boyfriend(s) what my art looked like, and sometime later there would be a short-lived art movement based on my art, both in Los Angeles and in New York City, and probably other locales.

The earliest occurrence of this that I can remember was the short lived Art Movement

of **Minimalist Boxes / Conceptual Sculptures** which I did in the 1960's, with variations I have done on and off since then. Occasionally I'd hear that a no-talent "artist" got a teaching job at a community college based on my creativity. A teaching job at a community college might not sound all that important to you, but to a "starving artist" it is a cushy job that doesn't involve carrying a 90 pound sack of concrete on a shoulder. Of course, the homosexuals saw to it that the art movements I inspired had no mention of me or my art.

On the point of my art being ignored by the art world, but my art getting appropriated by art dealers and their boyfriends, I just became aware that it's happening once again... It seems that "plywood boxes" are now "all the rage" in certain areas of New York city. I became aware of this in November of 2016 by tripping over an article about the boxes on the Internet. I didn't read much of the article 'cause it made me both angry and feeling sick to my stomach.

Below is a snapshot I made 'way back around 1989. It's a true snapshot because I had one exposure left on the roll of film, and I wanted to use it before developing the roll, but I didn't know what to take a picture of. I looked at a wall of my studio and saw the boxes, and I went "snap".



My work over the past 15 or so years also involves converting two dimensional images into three dimensional images. All of these images are printed on a flat piece of paper that comes out of my standard-normal computer printer. One technique I use involves converting the 2D visuals into 3D that have three levels of 3D. Part of the image *literally* floats a few inches in front of the surface of the art, while a second part recedes very far into the background. A third part remains where you'd expect it to be, that is, not floating in front of the image nor receding into the background. All of this is seen without wearing special glasses, etc.

The homosexual art mafia is not interested in these visuals, simply because I'm a *breeder* and not a homosexual, which means that I don't get drunk and/or do drugs and/or have sex with the right people in the art world. That being the case, I also don't have HIV-AIDS and/or other sexually transmitted diseases, nor do I have sex with little boys.

Not many people will see these 3D art pieces because the art doesn't reproduce on a computer or telephone screen. If they aren't seen in real life, the effect I described can't be seen. Happily for me, at least the homosexual "artists" can't rip me off again, because these images take skill and creativity and general smarts to make, all of which the homosexual "artists" lack.

Tom (The two requirements needed for art to be ART)

by Norman K. Breslow, 5/2/2014 and 10/16/16 and 1/16/17 v.2.4

(This entire essay was copyrighted © by Norman K. Breslow in 2014 and 2016 and 2017. You are welcome to share this essay with others. This essay may be reproduced, copied and distributed for noncommercial purposes, provided the essay remains in its complete original form. Thank you. Norman K. Breslow.)

(The following is yet one more of my thoughts which I'm attempting to share with others, but I've come to believe that my writings are similar to a note put into a bottle and tossed into the ocean. What's the chance that the bottle will be found, and the note is still legible, and is read by someone who can read English, and who will understand what he reads? Close to zero, I believe.)

Recently one of my recurring thoughts led me to a memory of a person I knew in the 1970s. His name was Tom Ruddick, or something that sounded like Ruddick.

But first, to set the stage, a little about my recurring thought. You see, I'm a *failed artist*, which means no one seems to be interested in my creations. My work is ignored by the powers-that-be in the art world. I have written in other essays that if I were a homosexual who got drunk with the right homosexuals in the art world, and also did drugs with them, and of course, had sex with them, I'm sure I would be proclaimed a genius, and my art would be selling for millions. Well, I'm happy I'm a failed artist. To help you understand why I'm happy to be a failed artist, I've inserted another short essay I wrote quite some time ago at the end of this essay.

Okay, so I was musing about being a failed artist, when it struck me that there were many other artists in my situation. This led to my recurring thought that **the conclusions of the writers in the fields of art history and art criticism are completely bogus**. And this recurring thought led me to think about Tom Ruddick. In the early 1970s, I watched Tom make a most amazing pencil rendering. I'll try to describe it, but I don't know if I'll be successful.

On a large sheet of drawing paper, probably measuring about two feet square, Tom made a pencil rendering of the front side of an Indian Head nickel. By rendered, I mean he drew each minor blemish on the nickel, so the viewer saw the drawing of the nickel as if he were looking at a black & white photograph.

Okay, Tom had a large piece of drawing paper and also had an Indian Head nickel. And he made a pencil rendering of the nickel. So what?

First, Tom drew a circle, freehand. That is, a circle made without using a compass or other device to make the drawing of the circle. He didn't do this with one sweep of his hand, but bit by bit from time to time over a few days.

Then, at various times over about six months, Tom would take a long close-up look at the nickel, put it down, and then he drew from memory what he had just scrutinized. He didn't look and then re-look while he made the drawing/rendering of that part of the nickel, but he looked at a section of the nickel once, and from memory, he rendered what he had seen. And he was making the rendering while mentally enlarging the nickel to fit into the circle which took up almost all of the large sheet of drawing paper.

Compare what you've just read about how Tom made his pencil rendering, which when finished looked like an enlarged photographic view of the five cent coin. *Think of the skill involved. and Tom's intent/desire to show off his talent.* Now think of an abstract splatter painting. What kind of skill did it take to make? What was the intent of the artist? I believe that **art involves both skill and intent on the part of the artist**. No skill or no intent equals no art.

I also believe that if the art historians and art critics did their drugs and had sex with more talented artists, maybe even with heterosexual artists, many of the conclusions found in the fields of art history and art criticism would be completely different. What do you think?

Below is my essay about my childhood, which explains why I'm happy to be a failed artist.

My childhood background

My father was a "high end" homosexual prostitute, being one of Norman Norell's many boyfriends. Norell was Calvin Kline before Calvin Kline. Norell met my father when my father was a teenage delivery boy for Hattie Carnegie, a high class department store in NYC. Occasionally my father would make deliveries or pickups at Norell's studio. Apparently my father was Norell's type. With Norell's help and encouragement, my father eventually went into the fashion business, designing and making women's belts, which were sold by high end department stores throughout the country, and which Norell used on the dresses he designed and manufactured. My father used his contacts with Norell and Norell's other boyfriends to keep his business running. It's not what you know, it's who you have sex with, I've learned.

Because my father wasn't a homosexual, he drank, morning, noon and night, beginning when he was a teenager, to enable himself to have sex with men. His choice. He'd rather be rich and rubbing elbows with the elites of the NYC fashion world, than be poor living in a ghetto in Hell's Kitchen where he grew up in New York City, and having a menial job working in a factory, and worrying about money. You know, being a normal person. So he lived his life being rich and successful, as far as the world was concerned, while hating every minute of it. I almost never saw him sober. His choice.

When he wasn't sucking and fucking his homosexual "friends", he was busy raping my sister, his daughter, who was two years older than me. I didn't know what he was doing to her, all I knew was that she was kinda crazy. That happens to sexually molested children.

I think he tried to pimp me out a few times when I was between 5 and 10. He'd sometimes take me to see good looking but creepy men, who seemed interested in seeing me without my clothes, but nothing else happened. I guess I wasn't their type, thank God.

*Another thing I remember is his constantly complaining that the other fashion designers were stealing his designs. I thought they came into his factory with a gun and took them. Now I understand that they'd get the buyers for various stores to tell them what my father's new "line" looked like before he showed it publicly, and then they used that information for the basis for their own new designs. I realized this years later when I found my art, which I showed to the homosexual art gallery owners when I was trying to break into the art world, used as the basis for the art of no talent homosexual artists, who were the ones given the credit for my creativity. **I guess I should have had sex with the powers in the art world to become a big time artist. Using my father's unhappy life as a homosexual prostitute as a guide, I'm glad I didn't. This is why I said I'm glad I'm a failed artist.***

Oh, my mother was as much of a monster as my father. She enabled his lifestyle, including his raping my sister, their daughter. She didn't want to live in a ghetto and work in a factory. She preferred to run my father's factory. And if he wanted to rape their daughter, okay by her. And if he had to be a homosexual prostitute, well, it did have a lot of benefits. Ugh.

Written by Norman K. Breslow at the age of 70, on May 2, 2014, godson and named for Norman Norell.

(Trivia: I read on the 'net some time ago that some people were trying to figure out where Norell came from, what his real name was, etc. No birth certificate for a Norman Norell could be found anywhere. Well, my father told me Norell's real name was Norman Elliot, from which came Norman Norell. For what it's worth.)

If I went my fathers route, I'm sure I'd be a well known artist today. But I learned from his mistake, so, **I'll repeat myself and say that I'm glad I'm a failed artist.**

nbreslow@aol.com

Film isn't an Art Form v 1.2 by Norman K. Breslow

Film isn't art. I get annoyed when I hear of actors referred to as "artists". They're not. Additionally, film is not an art form. What bothers me about an actor being called an artist, and film itself being called "art", is that no one person is responsible for the finished piece. It is a committee that creates the film, and I see art as being done by one person, who is responsible for its outcome. If you look at a sculpture and you like it, then you give the sculptor the credit. The same is true for a painting or a photograph. But who is responsible for the acting, or for an entire film?

Since you might not understand the process, I'll give a very brief explanation of how a film is made. Someone writes what the actor is to say. Then the actor is costumed, and lit, and camera angles are chosen. All these help set the atmosphere in which the actors words and visuals are viewed. Then there is the actual acting part. You know, "Scene 17, take 15 ". An actor says his lines over and over again. Maybe dozens of times. Maybe more. You try it now. How many ways can you say, "Hello". Many, if you try. Go ahead, try it now. This is what the actor does. (This shouldn't be too much of a revelation. Some "comedy" programs on TV show the "out takes" where the actors fluff their lines, showing that it isn't even necessary for the actors to be prepared by memorizing the script. If they get words wrong, if they get the inflection wrong, no problem- just do it again, and again, and again, until the director is satisfied.) And the director, needing something to do, makes suggestions to the actor as to new and different ways to say, "Hello".

After the actor has said all the words that were written for him, taking into consideration how the director wants them to be said, and re-said, and re-re-said, it is up to the editor, with help from the director, to string together all the words in such a way as to give the actor's character an overall "personality". Just who is responsible for this personality is anyone's guess, but it sure as hell isn't the actor. The actor is part of the committee, along with the director, writer, editor, cameraman, costumer, etc. No one person is responsible for the actor's "work". And without one person being responsible, I don't think there is any art.

And if the actor's "work" is done by committee, so is the entire film. Again, if no one is responsible for the look and feel and impact of the entire film, then it isn't art as far as I'm concerned.

Additionally, the same holds true for "recording artists" (ugh!). They go through a similar process, with various and myriad parts of their music being strung together (digital) bit by bit to create an entire song or tune. That is not art. Those who say it is are idiots!

There is one way for a film, and similarly music, to be a work of art. I suppose if the actor wrote the words, set up the camera and lights, chose the wardrobe, did the make-up, appeared by himself, and did the editing and sound mixing by himself, that would qualify as art, since one person would be responsible for the entire process, and for the outcome of the finished piece. In this case, if you don't like the film, you would know who to blame, and if you do like it, you would know who to congratulate.

18

My thoughts about George Soros v.1.4.4

(A very different view from what has been reported by others)

by

Norman K. Breslow, M.A., B.A., B.F.A.

This entire essay has been copyrighted © by Norman K. Breslow in 2017. You are welcome to share this essay with others. This essay may be reproduced, copied and distributed for noncommercial purposes, provided the essay remains in its complete original form. Thank you, Norman.

Much of what is written or said about George Soros seems to me to have been written by public relations companies. There is a certain insincere style in the writings by such companies. In short, I have found from my Internet readings that he is a wonderful man and a financial genius. Details about his life vary. Much of what I've found falls into the category of "perceptual management", which is a euphemism meaning intentionally telling half truths and outright lies to get people to believe something, which is the specialty of public relation firms.

I have found that George Soros is (probably) a Hungarian-American, who (probably) emigrated to England from Hungary in 1947. He may or may not have been in a Nazi concentration camp during the Second World War. He probably attended the London School of Economics and reportedly graduated with a bachelor's and/or master's degree in philosophy. (The reported degree or degrees in philosophy may be due to a misunderstanding of the meaning of academic degrees on the part of his biography writers. Or not.)

He began his business career by taking various jobs at banks in England and later the United States, before starting his own hedge fund in 1969. Over time his business skill made him very rich, or so we are led to believe. He is known as "The Man Who Broke the Bank of England", which is the British equivalent of the American Federal Reserve System. One would probably need the equivalent of a doctorate degree in economics and/or banking to really understand how he Broke the Bank of England. Most of the explanations I've read are examples of perceptual management.

As an example, I found that his early studies of philosophy [sic?] led him to develop and apply Karl Popper's General Theory of Reflexivity to capital markets, which he purportedly said gives him a good picture of asset bubbles and the fundamental/market value of securities, as well as value discrepancies used for shorting and swapping stocks.

Try searching for Reflexivity or Reflexivity Theory or Reflexivity George Soros and if you understand what you read, maybe you qualify for a doctorate degree in Economics or Sociology or banking or ?

I cut through the perceptive management gobbledygook and academic babble by accepting the following obvious logical thought as if it is a fact:

Some COUNTRY wanted to crash England's economic system. That country had all sorts of inside-confidential information which could be used. The people who ran that country realized that if they did crash the British Pound it might be thought of as an act of war, which might start a shooting war. They wanted to avoid that. What they needed was a "front", someone who could be pointed to and say, "it's all his doing". George Soros, with his degree(s) from the London School of Economics and background in banking and investing, seemed like he'd be a good choice for being the front. His role in being a front involved doing what he was told, be happy to be called a financial genius, and be happy to become very rich. So he became a front for the communists who want to destroy the capitalist system, and he lives very well while following orders. It's as simple as that. He just does what his owners tell him to do, or he goes along with what they do in his name.

Norman K. Breslow, M.A., B.A., B.F.A., October 21 and October 28, 2017.

On the concept of God v.1.0

Premise: The concept of God exists to give meaning to a person's life.

(you) Cutting to the chase, what's the meaning of life?

(me) There isn't any, says I.

If you are correct, a person lives and dies and that's it.

Yip, says I.

But I don't like that!

Tough, says I.

Do you have any supporting evidence for your premise?

Yeah.

So, give it to me.

Okay, Have you ever driven through an old town or city and seen the 100 year old office buildings, with a name over the entrance? You know, like "Milton W. Yardley", or something like that.

Yeah. So what's your point?

It's that nobody alive knows who that was, except maybe for the town historian or maybe Milton's great great grandchildren. And in time, those who come after them won't know either. If you track down the town historian, you might find that Milton started the first lumber mill in the town over a hundred years ago. Got my drift?

So where does the concept of God come in?

Because bunches of people realized that at some point after they die, no one is going to know that they ever lived, and they don't like that, so they assign to God the job of keeping their memory "alive", and that's that. He won't forget, you know.

Well, where do the concepts of heaven and hell come in, and all the other stuff surrounding God?

Just filler, is all. Just stuff to make God important and so be the valuable keeper of the memory that you once existed. God knows you once lived, and that's that.

This entire essay is copyrighted © by Norman K. Breslow in 2017. You are welcome to share this essay with others. This essay may be reproduced, copied and distributed for noncommercial purposes, provided the essay remains in its complete original form.

Thank you, Norman K. Breslow.

20

11/26/2017 **A Complex Thought v. 1.2** by Norman K. Breslow, B.F.A., B.A., M.A.

This is a sketch of a complex thought which is still forming in my head, or maybe has formed, and I am trying to come up with words to adequately explain it.

The thought started today when I read some articles on the Internet involving the "big bang theory" and the concept of time, etc.

It occurred to me that the measurements being made of background radiation etc., were only meaningful because the human brain is capable of experiencing/understanding/believing in something we call background radiation.

Put another way, let's use as an example a thermometer to measure air temperature. Our brain tells us that there are some things we call hot and cold. If our brain didn't tell us this, then we wouldn't have a thermometer because the concept for the need for the existence of a thermometer wouldn't exist, nor would the concepts needed to make one exist.

So, all of the measurements scientists use to examine "background radiation" and the like are only measurements of something or somethings that our brain tells us exist. If our brain didn't tell us that something exists we wouldn't have machines to measure those things/stuff, because there wouldn't be knowledge of their existence.

Of course, even if we had no concept of heat, we would have noticed that when two pieces of metal rapidly rub together, one or both tend to deform or melt. We might have the concept of friction, but not a concept that heat builds up during friction, because we would know nothing of heat.

So, scientists might invest a lot of brainpower into theorizing why the metal melts/deforms, and might invest a lot of time and money building machines to try of detect "stuff" which might explain the deforming of the metal. Some scientists might have noticed a sound before the metal deformed, and so various hypotheses and theories might be formulated to explain the sound, which are then investigated using costly devices trying to determine how and why the sound causes the metal to deform.

Regardless, we would still only have a theoretical "belief" as to what was causing the deformation, not an actual understanding of "heat", because in our example our brains can't understand the concept of "heat".

The concept that our brains create our world is similar to Plato's *shadow on the wall* allegory, which tells us that all we know are the shadows on a wall, not what is causing the shadows, or that they are shadows. To better understand this, take a course in the area of psychology called *Sensation & Perception*, or go to:

http://allpsych.com/psychology101/sensation_perception/

Why Communists are Communists, v.1.2.1

This entire essay is copyrighted © by Norman K. Breslow in 2014 and 2018, and it may be distributed for noncommercial purposes, provided the essay remains in its complete original form.

Thank you. Norman K. Breslow

Communists, (also known as socialists or progressives or liberals or democrats or republicans) are control freaks because they were abused when they were children, and so think that if they can control everyone and everything they can't be hurt again. WRONG.

If a normal person doesn't like a TV show, he doesn't watch it. If a Commie doesn't like a TV show, he wants it banned. Commies want to destroy what they don't like. When it's destroyed, they feel safer.

Because they were abused, they are very angry, and take that anger out on the entire world.

So, Commies want to control everything and everyone so they will feel safe, and get back at the world that didn't protect them when they were young. It's as simple as that.

Norman K. Breslow, M.A., B.A., B.F.A.
nbreslow@aol.com

22

Following is a listing of my background, for those who are interested.

B.F.A. Photography, Art Center College of Design, 1965-1968

B.A. Psychology, California State University, Los Angeles 1981-1982.

M.A. Psychology, California State University, Los Angeles, 1983.

Publications:

Lawrence, D. M., & Breslow, N. (1985).

Tick-tack-toe in iconic memory: A demonstration of informational persistence.
Perceptual and Motor Skills, Vol. 61(2) Oct 1985, 647-650.

Breslow, N., Evans, L. & Langley, J. (1985).

On the prevalence and roles of females in the sadomasochistic subculture:
Report of an empirical study.
Archives of Sexual Behavior, 14 (4), 303-317.

Breslow, N., Evans, L. & Langley, J. (1986).

Comparisons among heterosexual, bisexual and homosexual male sadomasochists.
Journal of Homosexuality, 13 (1), 83- 107.

Breslow, N. (1987).

Locus of control, desirability of control, and sadomasochists.
Psychological Reports, 61, 995-1001.

Breslow, N. (1989).

Sources of confusion in the study and treatment of sadomasochism.
Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 4 (3) 263-274.

1991 Basic Digital Photography, Norman Breslow, *Focal Press*

(The first published "How To" book on digital photography, in which the question I pose, *How many pixels would film have if film had pixels* I answer in a rather circumlocutive manner.)

2012 My documentary photographs, taken at the Ivar Theater in Hollywood CA in 1977, were included in a group show at the Drkrn Gallery in Hollywood CA titled *Camera Night at the Ivar*, from October 20 to November 25, 2012.

2013 The Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City accepted a donation of my very early digital photographs and imaging for research purposes.

2015 The Volkerding Center for Research & Academic Programs at the Center for Creative Photography at the University of Arizona, Tucson, accepted a donation of a large number of my early digital photographs and imaging for research purposes.

You can go to

http://www.flickr.com/photos/norman_breslow/

to see a few hundred photos I've made over the last 50 or so years. (Assuming that the link is still active and hasn't been modified.